DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 168 SO 020 014

AUTHOR Evans, Ronald W.
TITLE Teacher Conceptions of History: A Work-in-Progress. Draft.
PUB DATE 18 Nov 88
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (68th, Orlando, FL, November 18-22, 1988).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation; *Fundamental Concepts; *History; History Instruction; Secondary Schools; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS National Council for the Social Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper describes and analyzes teacher conceptions of the meaning of history. Previous research points to teacher conceptions as a crucial variable guiding curriculum decisions. Data for the study were collected through survey questionnaires and interviews. Data were analyzed by content analysis of fieldnotes, frequency analysis, and cross tabulation of survey questionnaires. The questionnaires were mailed to 160 secondary school history teachers in six central and eastern Maine counties and were returned by 71 respondents. Thirty subjects were selected for interviews. The data collected from interviews and questionnaires indicate that there are five composite teacher typologies: (1) storyteller, (2) scientific historian, (3) relativist/reformer, (4) cosmic philosopher, and (5) eclectic. Each category emphasizes a distinctly different conception of the purposes for studying history. The data also indicates that: teacher conceptions of history are related to background, belief, and knowledge; teaching methods and teacher views may relate to conceptions of history; and further research is needed. A 35-item bibliography and 5 figures detailing characteristics of the 5 teacher typologies using quotes from interviews are included. (CT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED312168

DRAFT

Teacher Conceptions of History: A Work-in-Progress

Ronald W. Evans
College of Education
University of Maine
Orono, ME 04469

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

RONALD W. EVANS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 014

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies
Orlando, Florida, November 18, 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The central purpose of this exploratory investigation is to describe and analyze teacher conceptions of the meaning of history. The study also explores factors which may shape teacher conceptions of the meaning of history. Data collection included survey and interviews. Data were analyzed using content analysis of fieldnotes, frequency analysis and crosstabulation of survey questionnaires. Patterns and themes which emerged were then developed into composite teacher typologies. Teacher typologies included five conceptions of history: the storyteller, the scientific historian, the relativist/reformer, the cosmic philosopher, and the eclectic. Teacher conceptions of history seem related to teacher ideology and to pedagogical orientation.

Teacher Conceptions of History

We are presently in the midst of a national revival of concern over the teaching of history in the schools. Diane Ravitch, an educational historian at Columbia University, Lynne Cheney of the National Endowment for the Humanities, California schools chief Bill Honig, and former U. S. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett among others are calling for a revival of history taught as history, chronologically. (Ravitch, 1987) However, the current revival of concern is failing to address many of the underlying questions which have kept the teaching of history in the schools in a perpetual state of crisis.

What conceptions do teachers hold of the meaning of history? What conceptions do they have of the purposes of historical study, of patterns in history, of its generalizability? The central aim of this investigation is to explore teacher conceptions of the meaning of history, the relationship between teacher conceptions of history and teaching style, and background factors which may influence development of teacher conceptions.

On the Status of History in Schools

Though history has lost its monopoly over the social studies curriculum, United States and world history have remained the two most frequently taken social studies courses. (Downey, 1985) Concern over the status of history in the schools is nothing new. The middle 1970s witnessed an outpouring of public comment about

history instruction and the problems that plagued it. Writer after writer predicted the demise of history as a separate subject (Mehaffy, 1982). The peak of concern was expressed in a report by Richard Kirkendall (1975) of the Organization of American Historians. Kirkendall declared that history was in a "state of crisis" because of declining history enrollments in the colleges and a trend away from history courses in the schools. In a 1977 survey on the status of the social studies, Gross reported that the number of high schools offering U. S. History dropped from 73 percent in 1961 to 53 percent in 1973 (Gross, 1977).

Though the 1970s reports of history's demise may have been exaggerated, many factors have combined to create an ongoing crisis. Student attitude problems have traditionally plagued the teaching of history. Students describe many history courses as boring, lifeless, and non-pragmatic. They complain about history's lack of relevance and protest its status as a required course (Morrissett, Hawke & Superka, 1980). Debate over the reasons for low student interest in history has been confined mostly to assertion rather than research or extended explanation. One noted historian accepted the view that history was irrelevant (Donald, 1977). Another attributed the lack of interest in history to neglect of the larger humanizing function of history in favor of increasingly narrow specialization (McNeill, 1976). Others attributed history's problems to poor teaching (Fite, 1975; Krug, 1978; Wesley, 1967). Probably the most frequent explanation

has been that much of the history taught is a compilation of myths about the past, irrelevant to the needs of minorities and too political, not sufficiently cultural or social (Hertzberg, 1980).

Despite such episodic bursts of concern over the teaching of history in schools, we should not mistakenly assume that history is a subject in danger of being displaced, for it is not. (Downey & Levstik, 1988) However, the fact remains that many students fail to gain much historical knowledge, fail to grasp the significance of our past, and fail to derive meaningful learning from their exposure to history in schools. (Ravitch & Finn, 1987) If history is to play an important role in the education of citizens, its meaning deserves extensive attention, especially conceptions of its meaning held by teachers.

Research Related to Teacher Conceptions

Despite the large amount of research on the social studies and history, scholars have devoted little attention to objectives, goals, or purpose. Historically, social educators have addressed objectives indirectly through debates over content and method. This resulted in a body of literature that was more assertion than research, leaving the social studies curriculum without clear objectives, purpose or definition (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977). Recent studies indicate that a relatively stable sequence of social studies courses is offered throughout the United States. Within these courses, however, objectives may vary according to textbook or teacher preference (Shaver, Davis & Helburn, 1979; Superka, Hawke & Morrissett, 1980;

Wiley, 1976). Among other factors, disagreement over the role and function of the social studies seems to preclude the clear definition of objectives. Social studies objectives are difficult to define and highly subject to proliferation (Gross, 1977). These findings underscore the complexity and confusion in the field and help to explain the minimal attention to objectives in the research literature. Yet, it is precisely this area, ill-defined and poorly researched, that is in need of direct attention.

Several strands of research point to teacher conceptions as a crucial variable guiding curriculum decisions. Brophy and Good (1974) argue that is is the teacher's belief system or conceptual base that is of most importance in shaping curricular decisions. Another study has noted the place of the teacher at the heart of the teaching process (Shaver, et al., 1979). Thus, a teacher's conception of the meaning of history may shape his or her curricular decisions.

The teacher's conceptual base is also influenced by cultural knowledge. Cultural knowledge includes beliefs, values, expectations, mental models, and formulas used in generating and interpreting classroom events. A recent study by Anderson-Levitt (1987) showed that cultural knowledge shapes teacher decision-making. Spindler (1987) found that teacher cultural knowledge guides successful classroom interaction. Thus, cultural factors may also shape teacher decision-making.

The growing body of research on teacher knowledge seems relevant

as well. Research on teacher knowledge has focused on three kinds of teacher knowledge: subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and curricular knowledge. As Shulman notes, research on teacher congnitions has fallen short in the "elucidation of teachers' cognitive understanding of subject matter content and the relationships between such understanding and the instruction teachers provide for students." (1986, p. 25) As Feiman-Nemser and Floden suggest, teacher knowledge is "actively related to the world of practice," and "functions as an organic whole, orienting her to her situation and allowing her to act." (1986, p. 513)

In one of the most important and relevant studies of teacher knowledge to date, Elbaz distinguishes three levels of practical knowledge: rules of practice, practical principles, and images. Images capture the teacher's knowledge and purposes at the most general level, orienting his/her overall conduct rather than directing specific actions. "The teacher's feelings, values, needs and beliefs combine as she forms images of how teaching should be, and marshalls experience, theoretical knowledge, and school folklore to give substance to these images." (1983, p. 134) Images mediate between thought and action, they guide teachers intuitively, inspiring rather than determining their actions.

Research on teacher perspectives has explored similar terrain, examining the purpose and context of particular teaching acts. Goodman and Adler (1985), in a recent study of elementary teacher

perspectives on social studies, found six major conceptualizations of social studies expressed through their informants beliefs and classroom actions. These included social studies as non-subject, as human relations, as citizenship indoctrination, as school knowledge, as the intefrative core of the elementary curriculum, and as education for social action.

Recent studies by Wilson and Wineburg (1987; 1988) focusing on history teachers' knowledge of subject matter and wisdom of practice have found that disciplinary perspective and depth of background have a profound impact on what history teachers teach, and how they execute their craft. Further, they suggest that knowledge of subject matter is central to teaching but not the sole determinant of good teaching.

Results of my own previous fieldwork on conceptions of history suggest that teacher conceptions of history vary; student conceptions are poorly formed; teacher conceptions shape the transmitted curriculum; and, student conceptions may be influenced by their teacher's conceptions. (Evans, 1988) These findings imply that teachers could devote more explicit attention to the lessons of history, and that more research is needed to clarify conceptions of the meaning of history and their impact on the educative process.

The aim of this study is to futher clarify teacher conceptions of the meaning of history. For purposes of this study, the meaning of history was defined to include four kinds of informant conceptions.

First, I examined informant conceptions of the purposes of historical study and valuations of its usefulness. Second, I explored conceptions of patterns in history, informant beliefs on progress and decline. Third, I examined the degree of generalization with which informants were comfortable. And, fourth, I investigated informant conceptions of the relevance of history, the relation of historical data to the present. Though the breadth and depth of the data collected for this illlustration may prohibit generalizable conclusions, it should be sufficient to generate grounded theory on conceptions of history, their possible impact on teaching style, and their relation to teacher background. This sort of grounded theory could provide a set of theoretical constructs based in practice, portraits of teacher thinking which might prove very useful to beginning and experienced practitioners. It may help us in our effort to understand what we are about.

Method

The study combined survey and interview data. Based on a previous exploration of teacher and student conceptions of history (Evans, 1988) and a review of the philosophy of history (Evans, 1988), a survey questionnaire was developed and mailed to all secondary school history teachers in six counties of central and eastern Maine (n=160). The primary purpose of the questionnaire was to generate potential interview subjects. The breadth of the sample was intentionally limited to areas relatively close to the researcher's

base. The questionnaire asked about teachers' concepts of history and personal background. Content validity was assessed by an independent judge and revised after two trials. Background items asked about years of teaching experience, undergraduate major, level of educational attainment, semester hours in history, political affiliation and point-of-view, gender, and religious affiliation. The questionnaire also asked for volunteers to participate in subsequent interviews. Data from the survey (71 questionnaires were returned) was analyzed for patterns of teacher response and preliminary teacher typologies were then developed. Teacher concepts of history were then cross tabulated with background information to determine patterns of teacher background which may relate to teacher conceptions of history.

Thirty interview subjects were then selected from the survey respondents who volunteered to participate in brief interviews. Though the sample was largely self-selected, subjects were selected from volunteers based on survey responses and geographic proximity. Interviews with each informant lasted approximately 50 minutes and probed teacher conceptions of the meaning of history (including the purposes of historical study, patterns in history, generalizability, and relevance), a description of the informant's teaching style, and teacher perspectives on the origins of their conceptions. For example, interview questions included: Tell me a few of your thoughts on the purposes for studying history? Are there patterns in

history? To what extent can we reliably make comparisons across time and space? Tell me a little about your teaching? What shaped your ideas about history? After each general question, similar questions phrased in a different manner were often asked, for example: What is history for? In addition, category probes were often used. On teaching method these included: textbook? lecture? discussion? other methods? Quotations from teacher interviews are verbatim in the text. Interview transcripts were summarized and paraphrased as necessary in charts, though, where possible, original wording was retained.

Data analysis began with a frequency analysis and a preliminary development of teacher typologies. Survey responses were then scored 0-6 for each respondent on each typology. Teacher typologies were then cross-tabulated with teacher background data. Teacher typologies were subsequently revised and developed in greater detail, drawing on interview data as a source for description of teacher conceptions of history. Interview and survey data were then combined to develop a comprehensive portrait of each teacher's conception of the meaning of history. Informants were selected for inclusion in interview summaries on the basis of survey scores.

Despite the researchers best efforts, the study has several limitations which may limit generalizability. First and foremost, the intent of the study is to describe teachers' conceptions of history with the aim of developing typologies that reflect various approaches.

The study is not designed to generate a random sample which will reflect the status of teacher conceptions in a generalizable way. Given the plethora of teaching deemed typical, and the voluminous research documenting its constancy, the author believes we can learn more from the diverse and the extraordiary. Second, the researcher relied on volunteers only, thus further restricting the generalizability of the sample. Reliance on volunteers was deemed necessary in order to find willing interview subjects who would openly discuss their thoughts on history and its meaning, but may make this a rather select group of research subjects. Perhaps the teachers who volunteered were those who felt comfortable answering questions about their teaching. Third, the findings reported here are based solely on interview and survey data. Though classroom observation would considerably enhance the findings, the central aim of this phase of the research project was to concentrate on teacher conceptions of history. Though the findings reported below may not be generalizable, the author believes that they are somewhat representative of what might be learned from a larger, more generalizable sample.

Results

Based on data from the teachers studied, conceptions of history, its purposes and meaning, seem to vary. This confirms the findings of my earlier study (Evans, 1988). Though teacher conceptions of history are not completely distinct, most teachers studied tend to

fall into one of five broad categories or typologies: storyteller, scientific historian, relativist/reformer, cosmic philosopher, or eclectic. These typologies, based on teacher conceptions of history, combine an approach to pedagogy and an epistemology. The dominant factor seems to be a conception of purpose. Each category emphasizes a distinctly different conception of the purposes for studying history. Though conceptions of purpose range from gaining knowledge to changing the future, these are not exclusive categories. Most teachers studied possess elements of more than one typology, though most also displayed a dominant tendency, similar to favoring one hand over the other. The following overview will highlight the characteristics of each typology.

Storyteller

Eight of the 71 teachers, or 11.3% of the sample, fit the storyteller model. Storytellers emphasize fascinating details about people and events and suggest that knowledge of other times, people, and places is the most important rationale for studying history. Each of these teachers runs a teacher-centered classroom in which teacher talk is dominant, and storytelling is a common mode. Generally, they suggest that we should emphasize the study of people and events to help our students grasp knowledge of basic facts and a sense of time.

In looking for a comparable theoretical model, the storyteller typology resembles the analytic idealist philosophy of history. The idealist does not explicitly address questions of meaning, instead

arguing that the events of the past are unique and that it is the historian's role to comprehend the unique particularity of past events, to explain through rich detail, in short, to tell a good story. Thus, the central purpose for studying history is to gain cultural knowledge, or to pay tribute to our predecessors. Because events are unique, no patterns exist. Generalizability is nil. We study history because it explains who we are, it gives us clues to our identity. Thus, the idealist history teacher can fulfill the ubiquitous purpose of explaining "what man is." (Collingwood, 1946) Currently in vogue among historians, this approach to history does little to illuminate the process of historical explanation, its relationship to ideology, or the significance of past trends or events. It is history writ small.

The storyteller typology is apparent in the following quotes (on purposes for studying history) from teachers interviewed:

> Studying history is one way we establish our identities; can't establish ones identity without having contact with the past. (John)[1]

> Its not so much that I try to tell the student anything, its that I try to make it interesting for them... I try to teach by storytelling. Like in ancient historic times I suppose the first teachers were the storytellers and when parents wanted to get rid of their kids for awhile, maybe there was some guy that liked to sit around

telling stories and had little kids listen to him and it worked. And it works for me. I can turn almost anything into a story. (John)

With age and being exposed to more and more material, you can turn what has happenned into story form. In other words you make it interesting, you don't try to justify it, you make it interesting. (John)

Knowledge is the mark of being an educated person. (Paula)

History is an escape. It's fun. It's like a giant soap opera. I talk about events and the kids love it because it's a story, and that's what history is. (Susan)

I think that, you know, really down deep, digging right into the soul here, that if a person does not know their background, that they are not a whole person; they're missing something and so I think it's very important that a person know their background, where they have been and maybe even paying tribute to those who have preceeded us. Their lives were worth something... Maybe its a thing of honoring past ancestors and their accomplishments. (Charles)

Figure 1 provides further detail on each of these teachers'

conceptions of history. On purpose, all four suggest that knowledge of history is part of becoming educated, a key element necessary to understand ourselves. This conception of purpose is consistent with the theoretical model described above. On pattern, these teachers seem to be split. Two see historical events as unique while two see some overarching patterns to history. They also seem to differ on the generalizability of history. Thus, these teachers seem not to fit the theoretical model in their beliefs on pattern and generalizability, or, rather, to fit it only partially. However, in their teaching style, all four fit the storyteller mode. Each mentions telling stories, often, it seems, as a means of making history come alive for students, and all four seem to rely on heavily teacher-centered methods of imparting knowledge of history.

Background data on these teachers suggests that the origins of the storyteller typology may be traceable to early experiences with historical novels and movies, parental influence, a fascination with stories, or an interest in ancestors. When asked to describe their political leanings, all four of these teachers described themselves as moderate conservatives. A crosstabulation of survey data on the larger sample also suggests that storytellers tend to be political conservatives. Five of eight storytellers identified themselves as right of center, as either conservative or moderately conservative. All four also have a relatively high concentration of semester hours of study in history, ranging from 39 to 90 and averaging 70 semester

hours of study in the discipline of history. Other interesting findings: three of the four identify a religious affiliation; and, survey data shows a slight tendency for beginning teachers to focus on a content orientation (66% of those teachers with five years of experience or less were either storytellers or scientific historians).

Though it may be impossible to make any definitive statements on the factors which may have shaped these teachers into storytellers, it seems that a tendency toward political conservatism and a strong background in the discipline of history are relevant factors. The teaching of history is shot through with ideological assumptions. Thus, a storyteller's approach to the teaching of history may develop from the interaction of an ideological base, a conception of history and its uses, and practical classroom experience. Each of these teachers has found that storytelling is an approach that works.

Scientific Historian

Thirteen of the 71 teachers surveyed or 18.3% of the sample fit the scientific historian model. These academic types suggest that historical explanation and interpretation makes history most interesting and argue that understanding historical processes and gaining background knowledge for understanding current issues are the key reasons for studying history. The scientific historian suggests that in teaching history we should emphasize a mix of uniqueness and similarities among people and events, and that it is most important for students to gain insight into historical

generalization and process skills of historical inquiry.

These teachers' practical philosophies resemble the analytic positivist philosophy of history. This group of historians see history as a form of scientific inquiry and tend to borrow methods from the natural sciences. Generally, they call for rigorous reliance on evidence and critical attention to primary sources so that historian and student may objectively attempt to discover truth. They see history as generalizable but disagree over the existence of universal laws. For the most part, they see no pattern in history, but do have faith in the existence of probabilities, generally sharing at least some agreement with the idea of progress. The scientific historians are united in their desire to make history more scientific, more objective. First popular among 19th century historians, the scientific mode probably had its greatest impact on history teaching through the New Social Studies movement of the 1960s and early 1970s with its focus on inquiry and use of primary sources.

The scientific typology is apparent in the following quotes from teacher interviews:

> Kids have to know where we've been before so they can see why we do things the way we do, why things are the way they are today and to understand what changes could be made. I think that just as a matter of culture, of passing on culture.... you have to have at least a nodding acquaintance with these general gross tendencies

and trends and the names and the people from history. (Steve)

I don't try to put words in their mouths at the end of it all. I don't finish with a flourish and tied neatly for them; I'd rather leave them questioning.... mor questions, more questions, fewer answers, fewer answers. It's hard for teenagers to accept though, because they want answers and every once in a while, we'll try to come to a conclusion, but I want them to test their hypothesis again and again and again and again. We write in that style; we hypothesize, we don't know in microns. Some teachers wouldn't find that comfortable, I'm sure. (Eric)

Right from the beginning in any level course I teach, I make it real clear that... that there are the facts, and that your interpretation of them is yours and.... that theirs is as valid as mine at any level and I encourage them to, you know, challenge and confront the book and to confront me and to put things in their own order, and often at the beginning of the year I'll ask some question which is interpretive and then read two totally different answers and try to get them to understand that both answers are valid as long as they're supported, as long as they're based upon evidence. (Rusty)

In my years of teaching I've only had a couple of kids who were real aware of my political persuasion.... I usually make it to the

> end of the year and they don't know whether I'm a Democrat or a Republican.... We work hard on understanding that everybody has a position and they are entitled to that, but, I think it's part of my job to keep my opinions right at home. (Rusty)

> We study history to understand the present, how we got here and the choices that have been made. We need different historical perspectives on questions like why our state tends to be economically depressed. (Sally)

Figure 2 provides more detail on these teachers' conceptions of history. On purpose, all four discuss skills common to the historian's trade. Three mention analytic or research skills, and all four mention perspectives or competing views or interpretations. A central element of these teachers approach to history is their attempt at scientific neutrality or objectivity. Though all four see some patterns in human history, several seem reluctant to discuss patterns as more than trends. Rusty exemplifies the general tone of providing different theories and letting the students decide. Though each of these teachers suggest that generalizations may be of some use, all four expressed caution about the limits of analogy and their reliability. This lack of comfort with generalizations is in keeping with the theoretical model developed above. In fact, the scientific philosophers of history developed as a critique of speculative

systems which were regarded as indefensible. The teaching style of each of these teachers exemplifies use of competing interpretations, the teacher as guide rather than arbiter of truth, and emphasis on thinking about important questions from history. Each attempts a rather transparent objectivity by posing open-ended questions for students.

Interview data from each of these four teachers suggests the importance of professors of history in shaping the thinking of each teacher. Three of the four directly mention their professors' emphasis on competing interpretations, on using evidence, on providing different perspectives. Generally, this emphasis belies a process orientation centered on the skills and issues discussed by historians. This group's orientation seems to have been shaped more by formal study and less by family. Their political orientation stands in sharp contrast to that of the storytellers. Three described themselves as liberals and the fourth as a moderate liberal. Survey data on the larger sample of scientific historians suggests that this group tends to be left-of-center or centrist politically. Eight of the thirteen teachers in this category described themselves as either radical left (1), liberal, or moderately liberal, while only three were right-of-center. Perhaps an orientation to teaching that emphasizes students reaching their own reasoned conclusions rather than an appreciation for ancestors is more in keeping with a liberal political ideology.

Another interesting fact about this group, three of the four stated no religious affiliation. Perhaps this reflects a lack of strong commitments, or, a scientist's attempt to remain detached from moral questions. Whichever may be the case, this fact seems to somehow fit the general world view of the scientific typology. Finally, all four of the teachers cited above have a very strong background in the discipline of history. Though they range from 30 to over 100 semester hours, their average, 78 hours, is highest among any of the groups studied.

Though it may be impossible to make any generalizable statements about the background factors which have shaped each of these teachers conception of history as a form of scientific inquiry, it seems that they were strongly influenced by their disciplinary background and seek to emulate the historians they have known. It also seems reasonable to suggest that their religious and political orientation generally provide an ideological backdrop in which fostering certain beliefs in their students is seen as less important than providing evidence and letting students reach their own conclusions. In any event, these teachers have found that the spirit of inquiry, the spirit of questioning, when played out in their classrooms, serves to stimulate student interest, activity, and thought.

Relativist/Reformer

By far the largest category, 32 of the 71 teachers surveyed fit the

relativist/reformer typology (45.1 % of the sample). This group emphasizes relation of the past to present problems and suggests that history is background for understanding current issues. Generally, these teachers endorse developing lessons from history to guide current decisions, and argue that tentative laws are possible and must be developed and examined in light of evidence. While stressing the similarity of people and events the relativists suggest that it's most important for students of history to grasp the relevance of history to the present.

These classroom teachers are similar in stance to the analytical relativist philosophers of history who will serve as a theoretical model for this typology. Analytical relativists argue that every aspect of historiography is infected with pre-conceptions, thus, scientific objectivity is impossible. These historians argue, as Charles Beard once did, that history represents "contemporary thought about our past" and that no historian can describe the past as it actually was. (1939) Historians of this group, from the progressives to the new left, are predominantly social reformers holding an explicit vision of a better world which guides much of their work. Many of the relativists among the teachers studied hold a similar vision of social justice, of a reformed society.

The following quotes illustrate the relativist/reformers' conception of the purposes for studying history:

My approach is to teach kids what history can teach us about our own situations. It is likely that they'll have to make important decisions throughout their life, or they'll react to certain feelings, resentments.... so I really use historical process to teach basically why America is in the mess it's in. I try to show them where this all comes from; how this all got started and why we are sort of still stuck with it. (Warren)

I think if you can draw attention to the fact that this country has made enormous mistakes, people have handled themselves poorly in almost every respect, partly because they're human beings and partly because of ignorance and partly because they're greedy.... but if you can draw attention to that, then I think you get them on track and looking at it and thinking about it and questioning what's happenning now. (Warren)

I see history as very much a dialectical process. I mean I have to admit there's a very, in my world view, a very Marxist sort of premise there and I do see processes through class and economic struggle but I think we can broaden that. I think there are a lot of struggles out there.... I think history teaches us about.... the great triplets, militarism, racism, and economic exploitation. (Warren)

I think, mainly, it's relating the past to the present.... I try to

draw parallels; things that happenned before, then try to apply them to what's going on now.... History is to be learned from.... If it isn't to learn from, then why do it?.... I think the best historians try to do that, try to draw lessons from the past. That's all I teach. That's how I try to teach anyway. (Tom)

The reasons that I see for teaching social studies (are) to help young people understand the present and it seems to me the past is actually the key to understanding what is going on today and why it's going on today and that we as people actually, people in a democracy have the ability to determine our own personal future as well as to help determine the future of the country and its effects upon the world as a whole. It seems to me that as a social studies teacher, we have a clear obligation to generate involvement in our democratic system.... (Jeff)

Figure 3 provides a more detailed overview of four relativist/reformers ideas about history. Each of these teachers emphasize the relation of history to the present. Perhaps the key element in each is the emphasis on making this a "better world," on trying to learn from our mistakes, and on student involvement in the community. Each teacher seems to be imposing a view that our world has many problems and that we share an obligation to seek improvment. This view is similar to an underlying assumption of the

social studies movement, that is, the central aim of civic education, social amelioration. (Evans, 1987)

Each of these relativist/reformers sees patterns in history. Furthermore, the patterns they see are generally more definitive than the patterns acceptable to any of the other typologies considered thus far. Two of the teachers see history as a dialectical process, and all four seem to suggest that we can influence the patterns of history through human action. Each teacher also views generalizability as a key component to the study of history and sees omparisons and analogies as the stuff of historical understanding, as a source of lessons valid so long as they are supported with evidence.

In teaching style, these teachers are similar to the scientific historians in that they pose problems for students while using a variety of methods. However, the key distinction is the source of such problems. For the scientific historian, problems come from competing interpretations of history, from the structure of the academic discipline. For the relativist/reformer, problems are drawn from present day issues and history made relevant to present concerns. Both are inquiry oriented.

What accounts for these teachers' relativist/reformer orientation? Three mention family influence, citing discussions or arguments on history and politics as they were growing up at home. All four also mention provocative teachers in high school or college. Interestingly, all four of these teachers describe themselves as

liberal democrats. Analysis of survey data from the larger sample suggests that the majority (20 of 31 or 65%) of relativist/reformers are left-of-center, describing themselves as either liberal or moderately liberal. Also, all four of the teachers examined above have Judeo-Christian religious affiliations. Relativist/reformers in the larger sample also tended to be Christian (81%). Finally, all four have a strong content background in history ranging from 30 to 60 semester hours, though the average of 49 hours is significantly lower than that for the other typologies described thus far.

One other interesting finding: more experienced teachers tend to be relativist/reformers at a rate slightly higher than those with less experience. Of those teachers with over five years experience, 49% were relativist/reformers whereas 66% of teachers with five years experience or less fit either the storyteller or scientific historian typology. This suggests that the relativist/reformer mode may also be related to years of experience.

Though this evidence is far from conclusive, each teacher's ideology, which combines liberalism and religious belief, seems to have had a major impact on their view of history, on their desire to set the world straight. Also, disciplinary background does not seem to be as strong a factor for this group. Regardless of the influences which may have shaped these teachers' conceptions of history, each has found success as a teacher through the relativist/reformer approach. Each has found that this approach can stimulate students to

study history and to relate the past to issues of the present in an effort to learn what we can do about changing the future.

Cosmic Philosopher

Though not a large group (two of the 71 teachers surveyed or 2.8% of the sample) the cosmic typology has several distinguishing characteristics. First, the cosmic teacher sees generalizations or "laws" connecting events as the most interesting aspect of history. Second, the cosmic philosopher sees definite patterns in history; though each may see a different pattern most suggest a cyclical view of history. Like the metahistorian, these teachers see grand theory as an essential part of history and believe that history has a profound meaning with implications for the future.

Speculative philosophers of history, metahistorians, tend to fall into one of three broad groups, the meta-physical, the empirical, or the cosmic. Meta-physical philosophers of history seek explanation that transcends observable experience, formulating universal laws to explain the powerful forces shaping the course of events. Empirical metahistorians attempt a similar synthesis of human experience, but make a stronger attempt to base speculation on historical evidence. Cosmic philosphers tend to attribute explanation to other worldly forces, usually described as providence or God. These strains of metahistory are united by their attempt to synthesize all of human experience, to locate human experience in a grand pattern. The same may be said for the "cosmic" teachers I interviewed.

The following quotes from teacher interviews provide some examples of cosmic thinking:

> History is the study of the human condition. The human form hasn't changed much, it's more or less the same. We still have rich and poor, we still have mysticism, war hasn't changed, societies still go through various stages quite similar to those that went before. It's all connected, humans have thought about the same things for centuries. (David)

> There are patterns in history. The example I use is that civilization emanates from a single human being, forms a group, which then goes through various stages, the tribe, the community, the city-state, the nation, and eventually the empire. Empires reach a certain point when they become cumbersome, then they disintegrate.... and the cycle starts over again. It is a cyclical pattern, entwined with nature like the life and death cycle of a human, or a tree, or the seasons. (David)

> We don't learn from our mistakes, that is the lesson.... History is moving toward Armageddon because we don't learn from the past. I wouldn't want to be a teenager today. I would like.... I try to teach optimistically, that we can learn, that we should learn, that there's hope, but if you want to be realistic we had a margin of

error in the past, before we had gotten to these nuclear bombs. But we don't have much margin of error now. (Leo)

Though each of these teachers' conception of history contains elements of other typologies, each strongly emphasizes a grand pattern. As figure 4 illustrates, both of these teachers discussed humans as an animal form, taking what might be described as a biological view of human history as a living organism. Both see a clear pattern in history, one of cycles, the other of decline. Both also view history as generalizable, and believe that generalizations can be quite reliable. Both teachers use process-centered approaches among a variety of teaching techniques. Both describe themselves as moderate liberals, and both have a strong religious connection: Leo is protestant; David earned his masters degree from a Jesuit institution.

The small size of this group in the sample and lack of any strong pattern make the origins of these teachers' ideas more difficult to trace. Survey data reveals little interesting insight into the cosmic philosopher, perhaps because there were only two cases. However, both did have high levels of educational attainment: one had a master's degree, the other a master's plus 45 semester hours. They averaged 49 semester hours of history. Also, both mentioned studying philosophy of history, and listed Toynbee as an influence.

Perhaps a later study can find more examples of this typology. At this point, my guess is that in each case a reading of cosmic

historians and religious background have had a profound impact on each teacher's thinking about history. Religious belief played a central role in the case for Jacob Neuman, a cosmic philosopher described in my earlier study. (Evans, 1988)

Eclectic

A fairly large group, 16 of the 71 teachers surveyed or 22.5% of the sample, had no central tendency, no score of four or higher in any category on the questionnaire analysis. Though some members of this group are probably closer to a typology than the questionnaire results will allow, most combine elements of two or more of the conceptions of history described above. The interview notes summarized in figure 5 illustrate this eclecticism.

When asked about the purposes for studying history, each of these teachers gave multiple answers. All four mentioned knowledge or appreciation of the past. Each teacher also mentioned at least one other purpose, such as interest, telling stories, relating the past to the present, helping the community, or mental exercise. The key similarity is that each of these teachers seemingly had no dominant tendency. Though they differed on their thoughts about patterns and generalizability, a second important area of similarity was in teaching style. Each of these teachers emphasized variety and student interest. In fact, the common element seems to be a very practical orientation toward getting students interested.

If these teachers' conceptions about history and their teaching

style are eclectic, it seems fitting that teacher background be somewhat eclectic as well. It may be little more than a curiosity, but all four mentioned stories told by family members, and three of the four mentioned history teachers they had in school. All had a religious affiliation, fewer semester hours in history courses, and described themselves as either political moderates or middle-of-the-road. Perhaps this moderation reflects an absence of strong ideological commitment consistent with eclecticsm. More than any other typology, this group's conceptions of history may have been tempered by the necessities of classroom teaching, by the need to somehow interest students in history.

Discussion

Though the data collected for this exploratory study are insufficient for developing firm conclusions, several findings are interesting and deserve further comment. To sum up:

1. Teacher conceptions of history, its purposes and meaning, seem to vary. Teachers studied tend to fall into one of five typologies: storyteller, scientific historian, relativist/reformer, cosmic philosopher, or eclectic. Each typology may be identified with longstanding traditions in philosophy of history, in social studies education, and often with larger philosophies of education. The storyteller typology is similar to the analytic idealist philosopher of history currently finding voice in the writings of Ravitch (1987) among others. Their emphasis on transmitting knowledge, on using

teacher-centered methods clearly places the storytellers in the citizenship transmission tradition in social studies. (Barr, et. al, 1977) Educationally, their emphasis on content knowledge is closest to the view held by the essentialist, a stance Brameld described as conservative "because he would solve the problems of our time by developing behavior skilled mainly in conserving rather than in changing the essential content and structure of the pre-existent world." (1955, p. 77)

The scientific historian typology is similar to the analytic positivist philosopher. Their emphasis on open-ended inquiry into historical questions, and their attempted scientific objectivity places this typology in the tradition of social science inquiry. (Barr, et. al, 1977) This is a group that Fitzgerald dubbed "mandarins" presumably because of their overuse of complex concepts from scholarly disciplines, concepts which seemed exotic to many teachers, students, and parents. (Fitzgerald, 1979) Educationally, this group might be seen as moderately progressive, but, because of their emphasis on scholarly knowledge, containing strong elements of essentialism as well.

The relativist/reformer is similar in outlook to the analytic relativist philosopher, viewing history as contemporary thought about our past and seeking to help students draw lessons for the future. Their orientation to the present, their emphasis on relating the past to current issues, and their vision of studying the past to build a

better future clearly places this group in the reflective inquiry tradition. (Barr, et. al, 1977) Educationally, these teachers are progressives and reconstructionists, philosophies which Brameld described as the educational counterparts of liberalism and radicalism. They are forward looking and future-centered respectively. In Brameld's words, "The progressivist is the genuine liberal because he would meet our crisis by developing minds and habits skilled as instruments in behalf of progressive, gradual, evolutionary change... The reconstructionist is the radical because he would solve our problems not by conserving, or modifying, or retreating, but by future looking." (1955, p. 77)

The cosmic philosopher has most in common with the speculative philosopher of history. This typology sees all experience as connected, part of a larger pattern, a pattern which has profound meaning. For these teachers, the human form remains unchanged, the key elements of existence are perennial. Thus, this typology may link most closely with perennialism, a philosophy that Brameld describes as backward looking, desiring a return to an earlier time. Again, Brameld states, "The perennialist is the regressivist because he would deal with contemporary issues by reacting against them in favor of solutions extraordinarily similar to those of a culture long past-or even escaping into an intellectual realm of timeless perfection." (1955, p. 77)

The eclectic represents lack of a coherent philosophy. The

eclectic takes a very pragmatic approach to teaching that is reflected in his or her conceptions about history, borrowing ideas and rationales from various traditions. Though not as consistent nor as easily defensible as each of the other typologies, the eclectic represents an admirable accomodation to the press of teaching. Their essence is contradiction, their style, a combination of approaches that work.

Though the above analysis discusses five major categories, these are not completely distinct nor are they all inclusive. Most teachers exhibit some elements of more than one typology, but display a dominant tendency. One wonders how aware teachers are of their teaching style and its fit with educational philosophy and ideology.

2. Teacher conceptions of history seem profoundly related to teacher background, teacher belief, and teacher knowledge. Among the factors mentioned by informants: previous teachers, college professors, family, books, and life experiences, though home and school factors seemed most important. In particular, political and religious background seem to play an especially important role, though the importance of each of these factors may vary considerably. For storytellers, it seems that a tendency toward political conservatism and a strong background in the discipline of history are relevant factors. For scientific historians, disciplinary background and particular professors of history seem most relevant, though political liberalism and lack of religious affiliation may also be

important. For relativist/reformers, family background, liberal political belief, and religious affiliation seem important while disciplinary background apparently played a less crucial role. For cosmic philosophers, religious belief may have played the most crucial role, and for eclectics, previous school teachers and the press of the classroom seem most important while absence of strong political convictions may have prevented development of a more definitive approach.

Thus, political belief seems related to teacher conceptions of history, though the relationship is not absolute or direct. Storytellers tend to be conservatives, relativist/reformers and scientific historians tend to be liberals, and eclectics show centrist tendencies. My earlier conclusion that the teaching of history can be a potent forum for imparting values (Evans, 1988) seems to be supported, at least in the majority of cases, by the data from this study. However, the political nature of historical thinking usually lurks beneath the surface, beneath the level of daily consciousness. As in historical interpretation, political beliefs tend to creep in through the back door.

3. Interview data suggest that pedagogy may relate strongly to conceptions of history. The idealist tells stories, the scientific historian promotes open-ended thinking about history, the reformer mixes methods to promote student questioning and to relate past to present, the cosmic philosopher challenges students with cosmic

interpretations, and the eclectic opts for variety to build student interest. However, survey data suggest that this relationship, between a teacher's conception of history and teaching style, may not hold in all cases. The general lack of relationship suggested by survey results could indicate that organizational constraints and the weight of traditional models of teaching have as much or more impact.

Conclusion

The findings of this study suggest the need for further research. Because of the limited and exploratory nature of this study, the findings reported here deserve corroboration, but also raise several other questions. Some questions which may prove interesting include:

1. What impact do teacher conceptions of the meaning of history have on the transmitted curriculum? On the received curriculum?
2. What conceptions of the meaning of history do students hold?
3. What impact, if any, do teacher conceptions have on student conceptions?
4. What relationship exists, if any, between the typologies reported above and student achievement? Student attitudes?

Phase two of this research project will focus on a few teachers in greater depth, each representing a specific typology. Data collection will include observation of classes and interviews with teachers and students in an effort to further explore some of these questions.

The typologies developed in this paper pose some very practical questions which cut to the core of theoretical approaches to the teaching of history. Which should we emulate? Which should we discount? How should we assess them? Of course, each teacher of history must come up with his or her own answers. At the very least, we see that the conception of history as story propagated by neo-conservative critics of the social studies is but one of many possibilities.

Teacher conceptions of history appear ingrained in teacher belief, knowledge of subject, knowledge of pedagogy, and political and religious ideology. As a conceptual category, Elbaz's "images" come close to capturing the essence of teacher conceptions of history and their probable role. (1983) These teachers possess images of history which inspire many of their actions. Thus, the teaching of history might be seen as a vehicle for teachers to express their ways of seeing the past, beliefs about the present, and visions of the future. Perhaps this exploration can help some teachers clarify their images of what history teaching should be, and help us all in developing ever more coherent approaches to the teaching of history. Given the current status of practice reported earlier, and the generally negative findings on student attitudes toward studying history, much clarification is needed.[2]

Endnote

1. The names used in this paper are pseudonyms.

2. The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge financial support received through a Faculty Research Grant from the University of Maine; the assistance of Walter McIntire and Theodore Coladarci with whom I consulted on quantitative aspects of the study; and, Suzanne Wilson who reviewed an early draft of the paper.

References

Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (1987) . Cultural knowledge for teaching first grade: an example from France. In G. Spindler (Ed.) , Interpretive ethnography of education at home and abroad. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L. & Shermis, S. S. (1977) . Defining the social studies. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies.

Becker, C. L. (1958) . Everyman his own historian. In P. L. Snyder (Ed.), Detachment and writing of history: essays and letters.

Brameld, T. (1955) . Philosophies of education in cultural perspective. New York: Dryden.

Brophy, J. & Good, T. (1974) . Teacher-student relationships: causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cheney, Lynn. (1987) . *American Memory*. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Collingwood, R. G. (1946) . The idea of history. London: Oxford University Press.

Donald, D. H. (1977) . Our irrelevant history. AHA newsletter, 15, 3-4.

Downey, M. T. (1985) . The status of history in the schools. In M. T. Downey (Ed.) History in the schools, pp. 1-12. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Downey, M. T. & Levstik, L. S. (1988) . Teaching and learning history:

The research base. Social Education, 52, 336-342.

Elbaz, F. (1983) . Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. New York: Nichols.

Evans, R. W. (1987) . Defining the worthy society: A history of the societal-problems approach in the social studies, 1895-1985. Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Evans, R. W. (1988) . Lessons from history: teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history. Theory and Research in Social Education, 16, 203-225.

Evans, R. W. (1988) . Philosophy of history: Implications for pedagogy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R. E. (1986) . The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Fite, G. C. (1975) . The historian as teacher: professional challenge and opportunity. Journal of southern history, 41, 3-18.

Fitzgerald, F. (1979) . America revised. New York: Vintage Books.

Goodman, J. & Adler, S. (1985) . Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study of perspectives. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13, 1-20.

Gross, R. E. (1977) . The status of the social studies in the public schools of the United States: facts and impressions of a national survey. Social Education, 41, 194-200, 205.

Hertzberg, H. W. (1980) . The teaching of history. In M. Kammen (Ed.) , The Past Before Us. (pp. 474-504) . London: Cornell University Press.

Krug, M. M. (1978) . On the crisis in the teaching of history. Illinois Schools Journal. 58, 20-26.

Kirkendall, R. S. (1975) . The status of history in the schools. Journal of American History. 62, 557-570.

McNeill, W. H. (1976) . History for citizens. AHA Newsletter. 14, 4-6.

Mehaffy, G. L. (1982) . History as subject matter. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. American Educational Research Association.

Morrissett, I., Hawke, S., & Superka, D. P. (1980) . Six problems for social studies in the 1980's. Social Education. 44, 561-569.

Ravitch, D. (1987) . "The Revival of History: Problems and Progress." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 24, Washington, D.C.

Ravitch, D. & Finn, C. (1987) . What do our 17-year-olds know. New York: Harper & Row.

Shaver, J. P., Davis, O. L., & Helburn, S. W. (1979) . The status of social studies education: impressions from three NSF studies. Social Education. 43, 150-153.

Shulman, L. S. (1986) . Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.).

Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1987). Schonhausen revisited and the rediscovery of culture. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Interpretive ethnography of education at home and abroad. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Superka, D. P., Hawkes, S. & Morrissett, I. (1980). The current and future status of the social studies. Social Education. 44, 362-369.

Wesley, E. B. (1967). Let's abolish history courses. Phi Delta Kappan. 49, 3-8.

Wiley, K. B. (1976). Social science education. Vol. 3 of The status of pre-college science, mathematics and social science education. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium.

Wilson, S. M. & Wineburg, S. S. (1987). Peering at history from different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in the teaching of American history. Paper presented at the AERA annual meeting, Washington, DC.

Wineburg, S. S. & Wilson, S. M. (1988). Models of wisdom in the teaching of history. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 50-58.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Storytellers

Figure 2. Scientific Historians

Figure 3. Reformers

Figure 4. Cosmic Philosophers

Figure 5. Eclectics

Figure 1: Storytellers

	Susan	John	Charles	Paula
Purpose	History is an escape. It's fun. It's like a gigantic soap opera. I talk about events and the kids love it because it's a story, and that's what history is. What it's for is to better understand ourselves. History touches everything in our lives... past events color how we think today, they color how we act, how things will be in the future.	History is one way that I believe we establish our identities; can't establish one's identity without having a contact with the past. It's not that I try to tell the student anything, I try to make it interesting. I teach by storytelling. It makes it easier for them to remember material. You don't try to justify it, you make it interesting.	If a person does not know their background, they are not a whole person... it's very important that a person know where they have been and maybe even paying tribute to those who have preceeded us... honoring past ancestors and their accomplishments. It also helps you mature as a person.	I was always interested in the facts and in learning about people, especially ancient people. Knowledge is the mark of being educated. We study history to know more. The book might mention people and what they did, but I tell them stories about their personal lives and it makes it more interesting for them.
Pattern	I think that everything happens over and over in different time frames. It's rather like the little circles you made in penmanship class... It isn't always the same, but pretty much it's a cycle of build up, level off and decay.	I think that there would be some kind of pattern, of course. There always seem to be conflicts. I teach a world history course and stress Hegel's definition of history, that history is the unfolding of man's struggle for freedom.	If there was a pattern it would be very small, very minute because history has changed... everyone is different, society has different ideas. I would almost go to the point of saying there is no pattern. Each time period is unique.	I think that each era is unique, but it all evolves together, so I think that you can look at each one differently. It's all wrapped together, one period led to the next. But, you have to look at each event for what it is... unique.
Generaliz-ability	You can't be real general... you've got that little kid in the back row with glasses who can get you so you have to be careful. I'm not sure how much you can learn from history in terms of not making mistakes. Everybody has to make their own.	You can generalize... for example, Americans have mistreated the environment. You have to start with a general concept. You have to teach from a generality to be effective. Predictions are possible only on sureties.	Only in a very general sense. You always have richer and poorer, strong and weak, those who rule and those who are ruled. Those are all generalities. You always have problems which confront man and man trying to overcome...	Generalizations can give you a feeling for an era. You can generalize about any subject, but it's more important to get a feeling for an era. I think it is possible to take certain events from the past and look to the future.
Teaching Style	I basically talk to the kids. I lecture a lot and I tell a lot of stories because I think history is fun. Tell a story and turn it into a movie, turn it into technicolor... and it makes people more real, and makes the book more real, makes it come alive.	The way that I teach is maybe the oldest way of teaching. I teach by storytelling. If you visit my class you'd see a teacher centered classroom. I am the center and everything comes from me. That doesn't mean I'm the sole arbiter of ideas.	Sometimes you've got to spoon feed them while other times you don't have to. I like to lecture. You've got to be almost like an entertainer. Start talking about reform movements and the class is snoring away. Talk blood and guts and its great.	I have question and answer periods. I lecture some. Most of them need a push and do not read the material. I combine vocabulary, questions from the text, lecture, and worksheets. Frankly, I'm more concerned about time with my family.
Teacher Background	I always liked to read historical novels, which is a good way to learn history... it was just my way of escaping. I was a voracious movie-goer. Another way of escaping. I was not around a lot of other kids.	I was always fascinated with history. Always. I mean preschool. My mother would read me King Arthur stories so I had a concept of knights in armor and it was long ago. I'm a genealogy bug and I've got loads of ancestors.	In school history was a favorite course of mine. I liked to see what my ancestors had done. My father liked history, he has history books, and served in the Navy in World War Two.	My father used to talk about history. He used to sit down and talk about people in history and he would pick up my books and he would see a different side of it than I would and we would sit down and discuss it.

Figure 2: Scientific Historians

	Rusty	Doug	Eric	Sally
Purpose	Right from the beginning I make it real clear that there are the facts, and that your interpretation of them is as valid as mine... and often I'll ask some question which is interpretive and then read two totally different answers... both answers are valid as long as they're supported by evidence. History puts things into larger context.	History helps you to understand events as they develop in the world, to know the historical background and to gain a long-term perspective. I think by delving deeply into into a time period or an issue you develop some analytical skills and some research skills that will serve you in any thing you want to study.	I don't try to put words in their mouths at the end of it all... I'd rather leave them questioning... It's hard for teenagers to accept though because they want answers... I want them to test their hypothesis again and again. History broadens the mind. It gives us a common vocabulary so we can communicate.	We study history to understand the present, how we got here and the choices that have been made. We need different historical perspectives on questions like why our state tends to be economically depressed. Historical understanding is necessary for us to make good decisions today.
Pattern	I don't teach "this fulfills a pattern." I try to give them a questioning framework and let them decide. I tell the kids about different theories. I think the human condition is pretty consistent. All those potentialities are there for progress or...	I think of history more as trends than patterns. I can see issues developing out of events of the past and those patterns are ongoing. I think there are patterns to a degree. There may be something to the rise and fall of great empires...	I am a devotee of the Schlesinger thesis, the cycle thesis. We have cycles and patterns that are worth studying. They give a semblance of hope to those that would like to see a return to a more caring, more thoughtful style of government.	There have been patterns of growth, then decline. Empires rise and fall... Each era has a flavor... they aren't totally different and the people involved aren't totally unique.
Generalizability	Each time period has unique qualities. I try to point out similarities, parallels, although those analogies and parallels have real limits. History is not very predictable, though we should have some consciousness of the range of our capabilities.	I think there are time periods that are similar, but I don't think you can make direct comparisons. It is possible to generalize like hell if you want to. I think your danger is always generalizing and saying something is a model... a real danger...	Hard to do that. Hard to do that. A.J.P. Tayor once said, after the dawn of the nuclear age, that if history is any guide we should all be begging for our death pills. We do generalize at times but it tends to turn off the students... we risk doing lousy scholarship.	You really can't generalize. Comparisons can be made but sometimes they are of little value. Comparisons can serve as a guide only in terms of providing warning signs. Using models to explain history can be problematic...
Teaching Style	I don't lecture. I try to get maximum involvement from the students. We do simulations and I have the kids have debates. We did a simulation the other day that I designed on the strike at the mill. My overall format is chronological.	Its primarily a pretty wide open discussion kind of history class. I don't do a lot of lecturing. I ask questions... I use conflicting quotes as a lead in to get the kids thinking and then expand on that. We get into different interpretations.	I use a variety of methods. Some kids like to discuss, some kids don't. I mean really discuss, not just say yes or no. I don't lecture. I'd rather pose questions from the material, have them answer and do my best to make everyone aware...	I make controversial statements about the past like, "Hitler didn't do anything wrong," to see how they react. I don't like textbooks... We use student research, mock trials, projects... I give them a framework and they choose.
Teacher Background	I worked with professors in graduate school who were very good. They made me confront the facts, be more disciplined and more organized and wouldn't let me get by with the easy answers... but they all allowed me to make my own judgement.	I've always enjoyed history, from the time I was a little kid. In high school it was dismal and boring but in college I had a course that got into all the different controversial aspects of history and different issues and things.	Professors, in lectures, made more of an impact than the material that they required us to read. The style I have today is probably based on that idea, that I'd rather talk history than labor over reading it unduly.	In college I began to question things. I had one professor who made history fascinating by providing different perspectives. My interest in history goes back to grade school. I remember reading biographies.

Figure 3: Reformers

	Warren	Tom	Jeff	Dan
Purpose	My approach is to teach kids what history can teach us about our own situations. ...so I really use historical process to teach basically why America is in the mess it's in. History is for learning about process, it's for learning about how people get to a certain point culturally... and what you can do about it once you're there.	I think mainly its relating the past to the present and to try to learn from the mistakes that have been made. I try to draw parallels; things that happenned before then try to apply them to what's happenning now. Most of what we teach has happenned before... If it isn't to learn from, then why do it?	The reasons that I see for teaching social studies is (sic) to help young people understand the present and it seems to me the past is actually the key to understanding what is going on today... We have a clear obligation to generate involvement on the part of our students. We have the opportunity to determine our own future.	The key thing I try to emphasize to the kids is the fact that we're human beings making decisions and affecting lives. The old adage that history repeats itself really does apply if you take a good look at it. If we can learn from the mistakes of past people and build upon them then we're going to make a better world.
Pattern	I see history as very much a dialectical process... I have to admit there's... a very Marxist premise there... the whole struggle concept: economic, class, male-female, East-West, you name it. I think all of those can be seen to run across the board.	I think there are patterns. I believe in countervailing power, like when one group develops power, then some other group opposes it, and they clash for awhile, and then the new group makes a new power. I think its a cycle but I don't think its predictable.	I think there are patterns in history... the only time any of those patterns have any relevance at all is if we actually make use of those patterns. I think we have the opportunity to determine things, and there are factors that might influence the patterns.	Everything seems to be very cyclical in nature. I don't care what civilization you look at, it seems like we go up and we go down, but that something happens and the civilization declines. I don't know if we can do something about it.
Generalizability	To understand something from history and then generate solutions you have to be able to generalize or why bother. You've got to get to a deeper understanding of what makes people tick, why they're still doing the things they were doing 400 years ago.	I think we can make some comparisons. Human nature is the same whether time periods are different or not. You have to be able to generalize about history or else it's just a list of facts. I think the best historians try to draw lessons from the past.	It's very possible to make generalizations. I like my students to be able to document the generalizations they make, to have historical evidence to back them up. That isn't to say we're going to exclude or ignore the uniqueness of a particular period.	Time periods are unique but they have a common ground that you can compare. I think they are all related. Human beings are basically the same regardless where you're talking about. I like to generalize, but you have to back it with specifics.
Teaching Style	I try to keep it varied. I talk and I ask people for responses and try to get them to think about issues. I do a lot of lecture. I try to use a lot of outside readings. We study things that have a bearing on the basic issues that I am concerned with.	I use lecture/discussion. I try to provoke thought and provoke questions, and I question students, and sometimes I say kind of outrageous things to make them think. I might advocate an attack on the Soviet Union just to see what students would say.	I tend to use a very practical approach. We don't just talk about it and read about it... we have vistors and field trips and can begin to explore issues directly. I have them read a variety of sources, then I ask questions... to relate to issues of the present.	A lot of discussion and question and answer. It's very open. I do lecture but not too much. We do a lot of reading and research papers. I use the jurisprudential model a lot. It's a good way to examine both sides and get kids involved.
Teacher Background	The single most important thing that ever happenned to me as far as studying history... as a first year graduate student I had a professor who was a material anthropologist. The university called him a Marxist. He changed my thinking.	Discussions. I grew up in a family that read, and I can remember historical type discussions, and all these books were around. My father was very conservative... I kind of rebelled against that. I had traditional teachers but they were provocative.	I had a fascination for historical artifacts... read the landmark books as a child. My parents were survivors of the holocaust and I was influenced by my father's pacifism and liberalism. My H.S. teacher wanted us to think about issues in historical context.	My parents had friends that came over and they always argued about politics. It was friendly arguments, but it's funny, I can always remember that. I had a history professor in college who was very provocative... and I'd like to emulate.

Figure 4: Cosmic Philosophers

	David	Leo
Purpose	I am primarily concerned with my student's ability to think, to solve problems. I wonder how they are going to cope with the 21st century, how they are going to adjust to living, make decisions. History is the entire study of the human endeavor... an understanding of that foundation allows them to study and master the other subjects. The historical process is continual and it's all linked together. There is essentially an animal form. It has gone through various stages and experiences but they are all quite similar. Humans have thought about these similar things and they have addressed the same questions. The historical process will continue... It's all connected.	Using the past, hopefully you can communicate to kids where our species, you know, homo sapiens, has gone wrong and continues to go wrong and you know we do not learn from our historical experiences. You look at the cycles of history, you try to communicate the idea that there's a certain predictability...
Pattern	Civilization emanates from a single human being... then for whatever reason they form a group and that group goes through various stages... that extend from a domestic tribal existence into a community, a city state, and states into nations. Then if that nation comes together and everything is in its place, it extends its boundaries into an empire. Empires reach a certain point where they no longer function, then they disintegrate. The pattern is reoccurring... not any different than the life or death cycle of a tree.	The pattern is the weakness of man, his inability to resist temptation. I try to teach optimistically, but if you want to be realistic, with these nuclear bombs we don't have much margin of error. We don't learn... we're moving toward Armageddon.
Generalizability	Comparisons are constantly made, and they have to be made, but they have to be astute in the concepts of time. 1988 and 1488. What were the empires doing in 1488 that is so different than what the American empire is doing in 1988. We have to understand that in 1488 those colonial empires were very similar to the American empire. History changes because people think, but the overall human condition isn't changing. Humans can think and change the course of history... It's open ended.	I believe in generalization. We repeat the mistakes of the past, and you can show analogies that are valid. With our lack of attention to govenment we get what we deserve in politicians. As ye sow, so shall ye reap... We don't learn from our mistakes.
Teaching Style	My courses have a standard text. I supplement that with anything and everything that I can get my hands on, depending on what I think the students need. I lecture, engage in discussion with the students, engage in debate. Very often I play the devil's advocate. I challenge their values, their morality, whatever they think is right or wrong. I use a critical thinking process. I demand that they write essays, that they read x number of books, write critical book reviews and that they present these to the class.	I am an autocratic dictator. We get into some role-playing, I use the Nuremburg trials. We use study guides. I spend a lot of time on people and places and causation... the reasons why. I also spend a lot of effort on geography.
Teacher Background	I was going for my MBA and started taking some other courses, quite a bit of philosophy and some psych courses... then history. Two professors really turned me on to it, then I said bingo and just changed. I think I was just searching and whatever it was I found it and fell in love with it. My father used to always say he loved history in school, and it became a positive thing for me. Toynbee, I guess, has been a major influence on me. He made it interesting. And the Durant series.	Overall life experience, in Asia and Africa and the Middle East. I mean those are the formative years and they were years when I was in my late twenties and early thirties. Toynbee, H. G. Wells and his outline of the world both had an influence.

Figure 5: Eclectics

	Betty	Sumner	Paul	Donald
Purpose	To create a greater appreciation of some of the forefathers. Also, to make them understand that history does repeat itself... and that we can find parallels. I think that there are some fun things in history, you can get away from the conventional and find something that can interest a kid, just for pleasure.	I think its important that students have a knowledge of how this country came to be. So many things hinge on the government, people need a good background in American history. Maybe we can learn by our mistakes. I use history as a good way to tell stories and emphasize how things can relate to us today.	An appreciation of the past. In any culture or society you have to feel as if there is a base. Going back a little can make you aware, you can become more involved, more educated. Knowing the past can give you a greater understanding of what is going on now. Maybe that can help the community. It extends into real life.	I'm a traditionalist. I think the roots of the present are in the past. I look upon history as a survival course. If we do not learn... nothing else will survive. Knowledge is power. Sometimes it's for the sake of knowing. We need a certain body of knowledge to function. The mind, like the body, needs exercise.
Pattern	I think that there are patterns, but they are probably clouded or overshadowed by other things. I think that history has unique characteristics, but the overall premise is we can find some common denominators in many things that happenned.	There probably is an overall pattern. We talk about an age of peace and then there is an economic depression, then a war and this has more or less gone down through America and Europe. It's just something that keeps repeating itself. I don't think we progress.	There definitely is a pattern... a period of birth, then more advanced morals and ideals, then a nation gets more decadent. Everything seems to go in cycles. The cycles are completing faster and faster. Nothing lasts forever.	Does history repeat itself? The answer is obviously no. That would be taking a very complex situation and put a very simple answer to it. There is only a very broad, very general kind of pattern. Civilizations do rise and fall.
Generalizability	I think it is possible to make generalizations about anything. The validity depends on who is saying it and where it is coming from. We can look at mistakes... kind of like sitting at an athletic event and second guessing. We have to live with decisons.	You really shouldn't draw any generalizations but you can't help but do it. It's pretty hard to look at past revolutions and not compare them to things happenning today. In some cases we are bound to draw some parallels between time periods.	I don't believe we can learn from history. If you know the past and can appreciate the present... fine, that's good, but I don't think that anyone ever really learns from the past. There are too many factors involved, too many variables... all unique.	I'm constantly comparing and contrasting the past with the present. I believe that the student should understand the uniqueness of an event within the context of a country's history. I have a tendency to be careful with generalizations.
Teaching Style	A bit non-conventional in some ways. I do a lot of group work, a lot of simulations, projects and reports that are generated right here. I try to use a lot of primary documents... a lot of supplementary things. Whatever we do it has to relate to them.	When I teach it's a combination of lectures, student participation, and audio-visual... we do mock trials, and we talk about current events and how they relate. I tell stories about personalities and pretend to be them... I do anything to get the kids interested.	I try to involve the students as much as possible. I don't like to just lecture. I also involve my students in getting the material, and I like to hear their point-of-view. Sometimes I have them work in small groups. I bring in controversy.	Variety is the spice of life. Sometimes I lecture, sometimes I use group discussion, sometimes I use simulation games. My students do written research reports, they do oral reports. Variety is the spice of life. I cannot be bored in class.
Teacher Background	My grandfather was the local town historian. I listened to his stories about the lumber camps. I read biographies. I had a one teacher in high school who made it come alive. At home history was always respected as an important part of life.	My father told me stories of the Korean war. I had a 7th grade teacher who would try any ways to get the child to learn. It was just fascinating to listen to this person. He made history come alive. I think I pattern my teaching after him.	One history teacher in college was very good. I took all his courses... I remember stories told by my grandparents. My parents used to take me everywhere. It made me want to learn more... My father was engaged in politics. I tagged along.	My parents and a couple of teachers were a big influence on me. My mother and father came from the old country and used to tell stories of what Italy was like. My 9th grade world history teacher was great. So was one professor.